A

VINDICATION

OF THE

Antapologiſt,

AGAINST THE

DEFENCE

OF THE

Dean of St. *Paul's*

= Sherlock

APOLOGY.

LONDON,

Printed for *Richard Bentley* in *Ruſſel-Street* in *Covent-Garden*, 1695.

A VINDICATION OF THE Antapologiſt,

AGAINST THE Defence of the Dean of St. *Paul's* APOLOGY.

'TIS not my deſign to take the Defender's whole Book in pieces, and anſwer every Clauſe of it; there is no occaſion for that, a great deal of it ſignifies nothing, and is not worth any Man's notice. But I would know with what ingenuity, conſcience, or forehead a Man can vent ſuch baſe reproaches, contemptuous fleering ſcoffs and miſrepreſentations againſt a Perſon of ſo much worth? Does he think to come off by aſſerting [He cannot expoſe a Man without mentioning his Name] when 'tis generally known who is intended? *Def. p.* 14.

Firſt, for the *Ant.* being a *Socinian*, which is the Defender's continued Charge through the whole, he ſays, [He does not pretend to know his inward intention, all he has to do with, is his Book.] And yet there is not one *Def. p.* 4.

Clauſe in it that proves this, nay there are ſeveral paſſages to the contrary, as *Ant. p.* 45. "I from my heart re-"ceive every tittle of the Revealed Chriſtian Religion; "particularly as to thoſe two *Magnalia*, the *Trinity* and "*Incarnation*, and again, *Ant. p.* 5. to make the ſum of "my Sentiments plainer, the holy Scripture ſtates the "*Trinity* under the notion of three bearing witneſs in "Heaven, and adds, he has much more to ſay for that "exagitated Text, than to allow it wanting in any Co-"pies, on any other reaſon but their imperfection.

What could be ſaid more? Now this the *Def.* would
Def. p. 8. not ſee. [This third Section he does not know well what to make of] but ſays [in the firſt place he (the *Ant.*) would have none but Scripture-terms made uſe of in ſtating this Doctrine; but this, whether it were the Invention of old Hereticks, or new ones, hath been ſhewn to be in our caſe fooliſh and unreaſonable] I wiſh he had told us where he has ſhewn this, I cannot find it: The *Ant. p.* 21, 22. "quotes St. *Athanaſius*, and St. *Ambroſe*, as "complaining of unſcriptural words: But the *Def.* [is
Def. p. 22. not at leiſure to turn them over.]

A Man at this rate will never be confuted, if at one time he will not ſee things, and at another will not examine them, and when they pinch him will not know what to make of them. Methinks he can tend to paſs a ſtrange Complement on Scripture, God left it as a Rule of Faith to the end of the World. And why ſhould not the terms there ſerve our Times? What ſignifies it to ſay, [Hereticks may ſtill take them in their own ſenſe.] So
Def. p. 23. they may your Unſcriptural words: No doubt but thoſe Hereticks, who can pervert all Scripture-terms, may alſo thoſe others which we do contrive. But what made him overlook what is really in the beginning of the third Section, and bring in ſomething at a diſtance? He had no mind to ſee the *Ant.* appear no *Socinian*, he was reſol-

ved

ved to call him ſo. He forgot the *Jus Belli* in Controverſies, the obligation to Truth, Juſtice, and common Ingenuity there.

But farther, the *Ant.* being asked *p.* 44, 45. "Whether he does believe the Doctrine of the *Trinity* to be "defenſible or no? he anſwers, I do, as delivered in "Scripture, but not upon his (*viz.* Dr. *Sh.*) Novel De"finitions and Hypotheſes.

So, *p.* 46. "the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is a Fundamental, "if duly ſtated, and this he with Reverence acknow"ledges and believes, as Scripture ſtates it.

And, *p.* 48. "ſays, the denial of the *Trinity* duly ſtated "is Hereſie. And *Socinianiſm* he calls Hereſie, *p.* 50.

Now with what face can a Man pretend to anſwer this Book, overlook all this, and brand the Author ſtill for a *Socinian*, and yet profeſs that he [has nothing elſe to judge him by but the Book?] I am loath to ſay what he deſerves. *Def p.* 11.

The caſe was this, the very learned and peaceable *Ant.* met with a dangerous Explication of the *Trinity* by Dr. *Sh.* and ſeeing the ill Conſequences likely to attend the Church in wrangling about theſe matters at this time a day, "he deſired both parties would let this Conver"ſie alone, till fit time and place. *p.* 3. And that it "might reſt (for this Juncture) as 'twas above thirteen "hundred years ago determined by two General Coun"cils.

P. 33. He did not deſire us [tamely and ſilently to give up a Fundamental Article of Chriſtian Faith. *Def. p.* 2. Neither diſſwade from Writing only in defence of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. *Def. p.* 3. Nor does he beſeech one to be ſilent, and let the others Write, Talk, Rail, Argue, *&c.* he would not for Peace give up Truth, nor would betray Chriſtian Faith under the pretence of Peace and Moderation.] *Def. p.* 5. *Def. p.* 7.

This

This truly may be matter of Melancholy consideration to all good Men, notwithstanding his Scoffs, that a Man should give himself so strange a liberty of thinking and speaking. These are false imputations, and malicious insinuations still charged, even contrary to our Author's accounts; as we find *Ant. p.* 9. " If the " old way of speaking had been kept to, the suit for " peace had been let alone.

And what can be more disingenuous? I do wonder, even to astonishment, that our Defender should pretend to Write Controversie, and be no more true in his Charges; or just in his Consequences.

The business is, the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, as Dr. *Sh.* has stated it, is not a Fundamental of the Christian Faith; his mutual consciousness will not guard him from the inference of three Gods, since the Unity of Accord (not of Nature and Substance) is all that will follow from thence; and this, a true enquiry into the importance of the words without any farther trouble will make appear.

But he may not like this, because the Doctor would have the word Substance thrown away, as the cause of all the Errors Men are apt to fall into about the Mystery of the *Trinity:* And yet 'tis in our Articles, *Athanasian* and *Nicene* Creeds, and in the Doxology at the Communion on *Trinity-Sunday.* And pray who abuses the Church now? If the *Ant.* had said as much as the Apology does in this, he must have been banged about as an enemy to the Church, that he went to expose the Creeds, the Communion Service, and the Church of *England.* And truly he had reason enough, according to his notion, to be afraid of the word Substance; a little Logick will teach him, that three distinct Infinite Spirits are three distinct Infinite Substances, and he may tremble at what necessary consequence will quickly

ly

ly be found out. His Notion is but poorly, I may ſay not at all juſtified by a later pretended Defence; though he ſpits *Socinian* Seconds in the Animadverter's face. *Pag.* 32. there is a great deal of obſcure ſtuff to no purpoſe.

But the Defender advocates for the Dean, that though he [gives ſuch an Explication of the *Trinity*, as he believes to be true, he does not lay down his Hypotheſis as neceſſary to be expreſly believed by all] but the vain boaſting in the Apology, *p.* 85. will anſwer this, *viz.* that he has given ſuch a notion of the *Trinity* as is agreeable to the phraſe and expreſſion of Scripture, ſuch as ſolves all the difficulties of it. *Def. p.6.*

Let the Reader judge, Whether the Reaſons of the *Ant.* which the Defender mentions, hold good, though he will not allow them. They are theſe: If the *Socinians* be not the only perſons Heterodox in the Points of the *Trinity*, and if theſe are not the only Points in which they are Heterodox, then it follows not, ſays *Ant.* that he that deſired the Controverſie of the *Trinity* to be forborn at preſent, did deſire that no body would write againſt the *Socinians*, though his ſuit was chiefly to the *Dean* and Dr. *Wallis*. *Def.p.12.*

I cannot imagin why he takes pains to prove that [every Chriſtian or Divine muſt] write, (for that is according to the Diſcourſe there) [when the Catholick Faith is aſſaulted, or elſe he muſt be deemed a Neuter, or not Orthodox,] then there muſt be a thouſand Scriblers againſt one Heretical Pamphlet. What if there be no need of my Defence? I may ſtand by very innocently, and comfort my ſelf in ſeeing the Hereticks beaten by others, when there is no occaſion for me to help. *Def.p.13.*

The *Ant.* Explication of that Text, *p.* 23. does not [overthrow the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt] becauſe, if this *Def.p.23.*

this did not, there are other Texts to prove it; and nothing is ſaid to be in this againſt it. He does not ſay, his is the Senſe of the Text; but puts this to prove, that different Interpretations may be put on one Text, and a general Senſe may be ſometimes well enough; and ſtill he allows this "Text may not, "without Probability, be interpreted of the Eſſential "Spirit of God. So that 'twas fooliſhly and wickedly

*Def.p.*23. ſpiteful to ſay, as *Def.* does, that [this Example is not very much for his (the *Ant.*) Reputation, becauſe it can ſerve no other End, but to overthrow the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt.] Why muſt every thing neceſſarily be a Man's Deſign, which may be ſo, when as well it may not be ſo? But why more particularly muſt this be his End here, when 'tis brought to another Purpoſe, and another Deſign is mentioned; and nothing of that which our Adverſary's malevolent Inclination makes him fancy? And yet this Man does very ſo-

*Def. p.*4. lemnly tell us at firſt, [He does not pretend to know his inward Intentions; and therefore, whatever he ſhall ſay in his Reflections, let him not pretend that he does it to calumniate him, ſince all he has to do with is his Book;] what ſhall we think when there is plainly *Proteſtatio contra factum?*

*Def.p.*42. He goes on with his Falſe Charge, [That he (the *Ant.*) does plainly enough inſinuate, that it was not Reaſon or Scripture, but Humane Force, which carried it, and determined the Point in the Council of *Nice*] when there's no ſuch thing in the whole Book; and yet (according to his uſual Cuſtom) talking at Rovers, I am ſure without the Book he pretends to Anſwer, he gives us another Caſt of his Civility, that ['twas written with a Deſign (which he is very good at underſtanding) [to expoſe the *Nicene* Faith and Council, the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and the Church of *England*.]

And

And if we look back, we ſhall find him ſay, the *Ant.* [ſpeaks a great many fine things in behalf of the Coun- *Def. p.* 40.
cil of *Nice*, not worth repeating.] Let's ſee then what theſe things are. "I have, ſays the *Ant.* a true and "profound Veneration for that Council, and eſteem it "only Second to that of the Apoſtles in *Act.* 15. Who "can think otherwiſe of it, that conſiders the number "of the Fathers therein; or otherwiſe, that reflects on "the Quality of many of them; the Number Three "Hundred and Eighteen; their Quality, divers of them "ſuch, who had even at that time bid fair for Martyr-"dom; Confeſſors of the Firſt Rank, that bore in "their Body στίγματα Χριστοῦ, the Marks of Chriſt; had "ſome of them their Hands cut off, had been ſeared and "tormented with Fire, and otherwiſe ſuffered for the "Faith of Jeſus; ſome had the Apoſtolick Gifts of Mi-"racles, and one Raiſed the Dead. *Ant. p.* 36. Were not theſe things worth repeating? A very remarkable thing, he means not fit for him to mention, becauſe then the *Ant.* proves himſelf no *Socinian*, and that does not ſerve the *Def.*'s turn.

But pray, What makes the *Def.* ſo averſe to the *Ant.*'s Propoſal, of calling in [a Concurring Power] to end the *Def. p.* 39.
Controverſie? Is it for the ſame Reaſon, that ſome Clients will not ſubmit to a Reference, becauſe they love wrangling and going to Law? Or is he afraid of a Convocation? This he would have [not reaſonable nor practicable:] Why ſo? The King can, and will (I hope) call one, if asked; when a growing Hereſie infeſts the Church, they can come together, and they will act in ſuch a caſe; and he that thinks otherwiſe, abuſes the Conſtitution, or the Perſons in it. But the *Def.* tells you, [This is not a fair Propoſal; for the Hereticks *Def. p.* 39.
muſt be firſt gratified, the Forms of Worſhip, and the Doctrine of the *Trinity* thrown out of the Liturgy] when the *Ant.* ſays no ſuch thing. He makes what he

pleaſes, and fathers it on this honeſt abſent Perſon: When he cannot tell what to Anſwer, he then mentions ſomething odious, and runs a great way after his own Shadow with open Mouth: And this he does not only here, but in many other places of his Defence. Let the Reader compare the Books.

As we may ſee again, he cites the *Ant. p.* 52. ſaying,
Def. p. 57 [That no Practice be impoſed upon any contrary to their Conſciences. The Meaning of which he takes to be, That no Expreſſions ſhould be allowed in the Liturgy, which any one profeſſes are againſt his Conſcience; nor any Rite or Ceremony required, which all are not ſatisfied in; and ſo we muſt part with Epiſcopacy, and all Order and Decency, *&c.*] He calls him, [Brave Proteſtant Reconciler. And ſays, 'Tis admirable Arguing for a Church of *England*-Man, who has read Fathers and School-men.] Pray let's ſee how the *Defender* has here uſed him; take all his Words: "In "ſuch Myſterious Points which we cannot underſtand, "or clear our ſelves in, we ſhall be permitted to ſu- "ſpend our Judgment, and not be required to declare "any further Aſſent and Conſent to the Churches De- "terminations, than that we will not contradict or "teach contrary thereto; withal, that in the mean "time no Practice be impoſed upon any, contrary to "their Conſcience. But I would have it noted here, "that I neither in my Paper did, nor do I now expoſe "this Temper, as a Mean to qualifie Men for Church- "Preferments, but only for Communion. *Ant.* p. 51, 52. God deliver us from the Tongues and Pens of falſe and wicked Miſrepreſenters. 'Tis not diſingenuous to know the true Meaning, and lay open the juſt Conſequences of any Saying; but 'tis abuſive to put a falſe Conſtruction on Words, to mutilate a Sentence to make it look worſe than it is. I agree with the *Defender*, that

that [there are Men of perverſe Minds and weak Heads:] I am ſure ſome are blinded with Spite, and infatuated by Prejudice. *Def. p.* 36.

As to our Authors Latitude of Faith and negative Belief, and as to the Title of *Melancholy Stander-by*, which the *Defender* makes himſelf with Dulneſs enough ſo often merry with, let him but take the Account given in the Antapology with a Candid Mind, and a Chriſtian Temper, and I believe they will ſhift well enough for themſelves; however, he may find reaſon to be a little more ſerious in his Behaviour about ſuch matters.

We meet with a mighty Buſtle made about *p.* 31. of *Ant.* a great deal is ſpent upon the Words of it: And yet, upon a moſt ſtrict and impartial Examination, I profeſs, I do not find any Occaſion given for this Heap of ill Sayings; they are not expreſly, nor by Conſequence, to be found there. *Def. p.* 30, 31, 32, 33, *&c.*

They are theſe:

[That the Fundamental Articles of Chriſtian Faith are revealed in ſuch ambiguous Terms, that we cannot underſtand the true Senſe of them; or at leaſt few can. *Def. p.* 31.

That God meant no Senſe, but intended that every Man ſhould believe them in what Senſe he pleaſed. 31.

That he charges all the Hereſies and Infidelity in the World on God Almighty, by his Latitude of Faith, by the different Degrees and Meaſures of Faith which God gives, *&c.* 31.

That the Church muſt not require an open Profeſſion of the true Faith. 31.

That nothing will uphold his Cauſe, but ſuch an Indifferency as will not allow the Church to concern her ſelf what Men believe, nor her Members to defend the true Faith. *Def. p.* 32.

Def.p.32. Lusts and Prejudices hinder me from discerning the clear Evidence of the Truth, and so long I cannot believe, and therefore I hope I shall be excused.]

Nor is there any Reason for these Questions to be put.

Def.p.33. [Does the Church desire no Man to believe the Creeds and Doctrine of the Trinity?

Is it to no purpose to teach Men the Truth? Or to require them to profess their Minds sincerely?]

And to these let me add, that [whether there be not *Def.p27.* some Christian Truths, which ought to be expresly believed by all Christians?]

My designed Brevity will not allow me to transcribe the whole; I refer the Reader to the Book; and I am very well satisfied, he will wonder at the Defender's bold Strokes. 'Tis easie to abuse by Questions, or to make Sayings against another; but I challenge him to prove, that these things necessarily follow from any Words there.

When all is done, we do subscribe in a large Sense, that must be admited to save the Charity of our Church from denouncing Damnation against the *Greek* Church, for want of the Word *Filioq*. He is not the best Friend to the Establishment, who takes the Sentence so strictly, as to damn every body that believes not every Word in the *Athanasian* Creed: It is certainly enough to believe the Substance of our Christian Faith, touching the *Trinity* and the *Incarnation* of the Son of God. I take that to be believing faithfully.

Dr. *Falkner* owns, That the *Athanasian* Creed gives some Explications, which are not so necessary to be understood and believed. *Lib. Ecc.* p. 146.

And Dr. *Stillingfleet* (now Bishop of *Worcester*) in his Vindication of his Answer to the King's Papers, pleads in behalf of the Eastern Churches, *p.* 23. in these Words:

Words: *Is it not a very hard Caſe theſe ſhould be excluded the Catholick Church, and conſequently from Salvation, for not rightly underſtanding the Subtilties of the Diſtinction betwixt Nature and Perſon?* &c.

And our Articles were never deſigned as Declarations of Truths, neceſſary to be believed only in one Senſe; but as Articles of Peace, which no Subſcriber ſhould Oppoſe or Preach againſt.

But I find our two Authors can by no means agree in their Politicks. *Ant.* is for Alterations, and an Union of Proteſtants (if it can be compaſſed) by reaſonable Methods: And, doubtleſs, he thinks his Way moſt likely (*rebus ſic ſtantibus*) to preſerve the Church.

The Defender has another ſort of Hopes and Belief. I confeſs ſincerely, I am not a fit Judge of ſuch matters; I ſhall therefore leave it to God's Providence, and the Wiſdom of my Superiours; praying heartily, that God will vouchſafe to continue our Liturgy in Uſe, Honour, and Veneration. *Def. p.* 63.

The *Ant.* is againſt Scholaſtick Terms in our Prayers: He names *Forbeſius*'s Exceptions; and he would have ſome one anſwer them more ſatisfactorily than he can contrive to do. Now our Defender had done well, if he had here inſerted an Anſwer to theſe; his Undertaking required it; but he did not think fit to meddle, but only tells you fleeringly, [He hopes there are ſome others in the Church, that can Anſwer ſo as he would have it Anſwered.] Can he do nothing but call Names, and infer bad Conſequences? But as long as the *Ant.* aſſerts in the midſt of all this, that the things excepted againſt may be uſed without Sin, *p.* 21. (we know what may be done without Sin, muſt be done when Authority commands) he does not give any Allowance to an Oppoſite Separation. *Def. p.* 21.

This

This all together would have been construed well enough by a Man not given to Bitterness, Wrath and Disputing. But however, make the worst of it, 'twill not amount to the Defender's Charge, or near it, *viz.*

Def. p. 21, 22. [That this Writing is directly against the received Doctrine of the *Trinity* and Established Worship, that the *Ant.* is a perfect Adversary to the Church.]

Def. p. 62. The *Def.* charges the *Ant.* for [giving up the Convocation, but he will [not follow him here] he

Def. p. 18. says [for good Reasons;] I suppose the same as when he says, [He has more Wit than to follow him through his Reading and the School-men.] An ingenuous Excuse: I can assure you, he is not a Man to be followed by every Body; as he has come very near the Character given of the *Nicene* Fathers, excepting their miraculous Gifts, so (I can say it without Vanity or Flattery) his Reading and Learning is more than common and ordinary; though the *Def.* says many little things of him, which provoked me to this. One Reason he names the

Def. p. 62. *Ant.* [is on the securer side.] Our Champion is like to make a brave Defender of our Faith, and our Church's Authority, who will not scratch his Hands, when his Adversary has got the safer Side. He gives up the Convocation no more than 'twas long before, as his History makes appear, which *Def.* would not touch.

'Tis certain, that Ecclesiastical Laws should not be made without Ecclesiastical Persons; this is according to the Primitive Canons, to the Proceedings of Christian Emperours, and to the Methods of *England*: 'Twas one of those ἀρχαῖα ἔθη, ancient Customs that our Nation has observed.

Farther, Queen *Elizabeth* since the Reformation, did prohibit the House of Commons medling in the ordering of Church-matters, as appears by Sir *Simonds D'Ewes*, *p.* 213.

The

The Speaker declared to the Houſe of Commons, that it was her Majeſty's Pleaſure, That from henceforth no Bills concerning Religion ſhall be preferred or received into this Houſe, unleſs the ſame ſhould be firſt conſidered and liked by the Clergy.

And we find the Perſons attempting it, were then ſome forbad the Houſe, others turned out of their Offices, others ſent to the *Tower*; nay, there was a Submiſſion made for tranſgreſſing in this, *Anno* 23. *p.* 284.

This is what (I gueſs) our *Def.* would be at, but he is reſolved not to burn his Fingers, and I am perſwaded the *Ant.* is ſatisfied in all this.

But whatever it was heretofore, we are to examine what the Cuſtom has been for a conſiderable time paſt; and here we ſhall find, if the King give the Parliament leave to meddle in Eccleſiaſtical Matters, and they do make a Law without a Lower Houſe of Convocation, this will be obligatory: Whether we like it, or not, ſo it is.

The next Charge againſt the *Ant.* is, that he ſays, [Other Diſſenters have benefit by the Act of Toleration, who do not renounce *Socinianiſm*, contrary to the expreſs words of the Act.] And here the *Ant.* very [ſenſe, ſincerity, and modeſty] are queſtioned; he claps his wings, and crows as if he were inſulting over his conquer'd adverſary: Nay, he puts him in a way to excuſe himſelf, that he [was impoſed upon by hear-ſay, or by a haſty concluſion, that becauſe it was an Act of Indulgence to Diſſenters, it muſt certainly indulge the innocent and true Proteſtant *Socinians* among the reſt.] Very kindly done! but not too faſt, look upon the Act, Pages in it are 309 and 317. *Def.* p. 64.

In the former 'tis provided that Perſons in Holy Orders, or pretending to Holy Orders, Preachers, or Teachers in Diſſenting Congregations, ſhall be free from the Penalties of the Act for reſtraining Nonconformiſts from inhabiting

inhabiting in Corporations, and of the Act of Uniformity; upon condition only of the taking the Oaths, and declaring the approbation of, and subscribing to the Articles of Religion mentioned in a Statute made, 13 *Eliz.* (*viz.* 39 Articles) except 34, 35, 36. and some words of the 20*th*.

In the other Clause 'tis Enacted, that the benefit of the Act shall not extend to any person that shall deny in his Preaching or Writing, the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, as it is declared in the aforesaid Articles of Religion. So that none but publick Preachers, *&c.* are comprehended in these Restrictions; all that are not so, may believe what they please concerning the *Trinity*, without being excluded from the benefit of this Act, and so indeed may Preachers too; only they must not teach publickly any thing contrary to those Articles they are to Subscribe and declare their approbation (not belief) of.

I shall conclude without returning his Scoffs, or his Lashes (which word used more than once ought to be recanted, as reflecting on a very Honourable Profession) with an earnest and a serious desire, that he will repent of all his Virulent and Malicious Speeches and Misrepresentations; that he will learn to be more true in his Charges, and just in his Consequences.

F I N I S.